REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are pending in the Application. Claims 1 and 10 are independent claims. Claims 1 and 10 have been amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The Patent Office rejected claims 1-5 and 10-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guggisberg ("Guggisberg", U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0029598) in view of Hilt et al. ("Hilt", U.S. Publication No. 2003/0046374). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

"To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations." (emphasis added) (MPEP § 2143). If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. (emphasis added) In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Applicant respectfully submits Claims 1-5 and 10-14 recite elements not disclosed by Guggisberg or Hilt. For example, Claims 1 and 10 generally recite messaging redirector plug-ins for a browser program which replace a corresponding messaging plug-in, each of said messaging redirector plug-ins using a respective and selected port to redirect selected messages which have been received at a workstation from the workstation to a digital telephone. Guggisberg and Hilt do not teach messaging redirector plug-ins for a browser program which replace a corresponding messaging plug-in. Guggisberg teaches routing of SMS messages through the Internet by converting the SMS message into a data format. Guggisberg does not disclose plug-ins at all and does not disclose replacing a corresponding messaging plug-in. Hilt does not remedy the defects of Guggisberg. Hilt teaches triggering the launch of an application on a computer utilizing a

peripheral which triggers the launch of a plug-in which in turn launches a browser, supplying the plug-in with a server address and uploading a first set of data to the server via the application, processing the first set of data into a second set and transmitting an address for the second set to the plug-in utilizing the server, and downloading the second set of data via the browser utilizing the address provided by the plug-in. Hilt does not disclose that the plug-in replaces a corresponding plug-in. The plug-in of Hilt does not replace another plug-in. Therefore, Guggisberg and Hilt do not teach messaging redirector plug-ins for a browser program which replace a corresponding messaging plug-in.

Further, Guggisberg and Hilt further do not teach messaging redirector plug-ins using a respective and selected port to redirect selected messages which have been received at a workstation from the workstation to a digital telephone. Guggisberg does not disclose plug-ins and does not disclose messaging redirector plug-ins using a respective and selected port to redirect selected messages from a workstation to a digital telephone. Hilt does not remedy the defects of Guggisberg. Hilt does not disclose that the plug-in redirects selected messages from a workstation to a digital telephone. Redirection is to change course or direction. The present invention intercepts messages which have been received at a workstation (their intended destination) and redirects them to a digital telephone. The plug-in of Hilt merely acts as a go between to avoid firewalls for an application, a browser, and a server so that the application can request data it needs the server to process from an address provided by the server. The plug-in does not redirect the communication between the application, browser, and server, it merely routes the communication along its intended path. The application, browser, and server intend to communicate with each other via the plug-in. The plug-in of Hilt performs no redirection. Therefore, Guggisberg and Hilt further do not teach messaging redirector plug-ins using a respective and selected port to redirect selected messages from a workstation to a digital telephone.

Guggisberg and Hilt, separately or combined, do not teach or suggest all of the claimed limitations. Thus, at least based on these reasons, independent Claims 1 and 10 are nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Claims 2-5 depend from Claim 1 and are therefore allowable due to their

dependence upon Claim 1. Claims 11-14 depend from Claim 10 and are therefore allowable due to their dependence upon Claim 10.

The Patent Office rejected claims 6-9 and 15-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guggisberg and Hilt in further view of Szlam et al. ("Szlam", U.S. Patent No. 6,359,892). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections. Claims 6-9, 19, and 20 depend from Claim 1, which is allowable for the reasons set forth above, and are thus allowable based on their dependence on an allowable base claim. Claims 15-18, 21, and 22 depend from Claim 10, which is allowable for the reasons set forth above, and are thus allowable based on their dependence on an allowable base claim.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. Issuance of the present application as a patent is therefore solicited.

It is believed no fee is due at this time. However, should the Examiner disagree, please charge the undersigned's Deposit Account No. 19-2179. Please also charge this deposit account, at any time during the pendency of this application, for any additional fees required, or credit any overpayment, pursuant to 37 CFR §1.25.

Date: 18 July 01

SIEMENS CORPORATION Customer Number: 28524 Intellectual Property Department 170 Wood Avenue South Iselin, New Jersey 08830

ATTENTION: Elsa Keller, IP Department

Telephone: (732) 321-3026

Respectfully submitted,

David D. Chung

Registration No. 38,409 Attorney for Applicants Tel: 408-492-5336

Fax: 408-492-3122